

United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.	
10/815,339	03/31/2004	Vilmos Keri	2664/58004	7521	
26646	7590 03/23/2006		EXAMINER		
KENYON & KENYON LLP ONE BROADWAY			KUNEMUND, ROBERT M		
NEW YORK, NY 10004			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER	
,			1722		

DATE MAILED: 03/23/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

					1
		Application No.	Applicant(s)		
Office Action Summary		10/815,339	KERI ET AL.		
		Examiner	Art Unit		
		Robert M. Kunemund	1722		
Period fo	The MAILING DATE of this communication app or Reply	pears on the cover sheet with the	correspondence a	address	
WHIC - Exte after - If NC - Failu Any	ORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY CHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DOWN IN THE MAILING THE	ATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION 36(a). In no event, however, may a reply be the state of	N. imely filed in the mailing date of this ED (35 U.S.C. § 133).		
Status					
1)	Responsive to communication(s) filed on	 -'			
2a) <u></u> ☐	This action is FINAL . 2b)⊠ This	action is non-final.			
3)	Since this application is in condition for allowar	nce except for formal matters, p	rosecution as to the	he merits is	
	closed in accordance with the practice under E	Ex parte Quayle, 1935 C.D. 11, 4	153 O.G. 213.		
Disposit	ion of Claims				
5) <u></u> 6)⊠	Claim(s) 1-36 is/are pending in the application 4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdraw Claim(s) is/are allowed. Claim(s) 1-36 is/are rejected. Claim(s) is/are objected to. Claim(s) are subject to restriction and/o	wn from consideration.			
Applicat	ion Papers				
10)	The specification is objected to by the Examine The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a) acc Applicant may not request that any objection to the Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correct The oath or declaration is objected to by the Ex	epted or b) objected to by the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. So tion is required if the drawing(s) is o	ee 37 CFR 1.85(a). bjected to. See 37		
Priority (under 35 U.S.C. § 119				
12)[_ a)	Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign All b) Some * c) None of: 1. Certified copies of the priority document 2. Certified copies of the priority document 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority document application from the International Bureau See the attached detailed Office action for a list	s have been received. s have been received in Applica rity documents have been receiv u (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).	tion No /ed in this Nationa	al Stage	
2) Notice (3) Information	ot(s) Due of References Cited (PTO-892) Due of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) Due of Draftsperson's Patement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) Due of No(s)/Mail Date	4) Interview Summar Paper No(s)/Mail I 5) Notice of Informal 6) Other:	Date	TO-152)	

Application/Control Number: 10/815,339

Art Unit: 1722

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

This application currently names joint inventors. In considering patentability of the claims under 35 U.S.C. 103(a), the examiner presumes that the subject matter of the various claims was commonly owned at the time any inventions covered therein were made absent any evidence to the contrary. Applicant is advised of the obligation under 37 CFR 1.56 to point out the inventor and invention dates of each claim that was not commonly owned at the time a later invention was made in order for the examiner to consider the applicability of 35 U.S.C. 103(c) and potential 35 U.S.C. 102(e), (f) or (g) prior art under 35 U.S.C. 103(a).

Claims 1 to 5, 7 to 13, 15 to 19, 21 to 27, 35 and 36 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Gletos (5,508,398).

The Gletos reference teaches a method of crystallizing macrolides, note entire reference. A macrolibe starting material is combined with two solvents, one polar and one a hydrocarbon, note, col.3. The hydrocarbon solvent can be toluene and the polar solvent can be ethyl acetate, note col. 4. The ph of the solution is adjusted either with an aqueous acid or base, note examples. This adds the water to the solution. The temperatures of crystallization are 40c or lower. The marcolide is then crystallized

Application/Control Number: 10/815,339

Art Unit: 1722

isolated and recovered. The sole difference between the instant claims and the prior art is the two phases. However, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to have the two phases as one solvent is water immiscible which would inherently and obviously create two phases of the solutions and crystallize form the phase which as the marcolibe.

Claims 6, 20, 29 to 32 and 34 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Gletos (5,508,398).

The Gletos reference is relied on for the same reasons as stated, supra, and differs from the instant claims in the time and temperatures of mixing. However, in the absence of unexpected results, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to determine through routine experimentations the optimum, operable temperature and times in the Gletos reference in order to ensure full mixing of the contents and increased crystallization rates.

Claims 14, 28 and 33 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Gletos (5,508,398) in view of Navarro (wo 00/33878).

The Gletos reference is relied on for the same reasons as stated, supra, and differs from the instant claims in the specific marcolides. However, the Navarro reference teaches crystallizing macrolides like ascomycins, note page 3. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to modify the Gletos process by the teachings of the Navarro reference to crystallize a specific marcolide in order to crystal them for use in pharmaceuticals.

Art Unit: 1722

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Robert M. Kunemund whose telephone number is 571-272-1464. The examiner can normally be reached on 8 hours.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Duane Smith can be reached on 571-272-1166. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

RMK

RIMARY EXAMINER